

82d Congress }
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION
ON
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION



SEPTEMBER 30, OCTOBER 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,
11, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION
ON
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION



SEPTEMBER 30, OCTOBER 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,
11, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

PHILIP B. PERLMAN, *Chairman*
EARL G. HARRISON, *Vice Chairman*
MSGT. JOHN O'GRADY
REV. THADDEUS F. GULLIKSON
CLARENCE E. PICKETT
ADRIAN S. FISHER
THOMAS C. FINUCANE

HARRY N. ROSENFIELD, *Executive Director*

REQUEST FOR TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., October 22, 1952.

HON. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,

*Chairman, President's Commission on
Immigration and Naturalization,*

Executive Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PERLMAN: I am informed that the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization has held hearings in a number of cities and has collected a great deal of information concerning the problems of immigration and naturalization.

Since the subject of immigration and naturalization requires continuous congressional study, it would be very helpful if this committee could have the transcript of your hearings available for its study and use, and for distribution to the Members of Congress.

If this record is available, will you please transmit it to me so that I may be able to take the necessary steps in order to have it printed for the use of the committee and Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman*

REPLY TO REQUEST

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, October 27, 1952.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Pursuant to the request in your letter of October 23, 1952, we shall be happy to make available to you a copy of the transcript of the hearings held by this Commission. We shall transmit the record to you as soon as the notes are transcribed.

The Commission held 30 sessions of hearings in 11 cities scattered across the entire country. These hearings were scheduled as a means of obtaining some appraisal of representative and responsible views on this subject. The Commission was amazed, and pleased, at the enormous and active interest of the American people in the subject of immigration and naturalization policy.

Every effort was made to obtain the opinions of all people who might have something to contribute to the Commission's consideration. All shades of opinion and points of views were sought and heard. The response was very heavy, and the record will include the testimony and statements of some 600 persons and organizations.

This record, we believe, includes some very valuable information, a goodly proportion of which has not hitherto been available in discussions of immigration and naturalization. It is of great help to the Commission in performing its duties. We hope that this material will be useful to your committee, to the Congress, and to the country.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. PERLMAN, *Chairman.*

CONTENTS

Sessions:

New York, N. Y.:

- First: September 30, 1952, morning session.
- Second: September 30, 1952, evening session.
- Third: October 1, 1952, morning session.
- Fourth: October 1, 1952, evening session.

Boston, Mass.:

- Fifth: October 2, 1952, morning session.
- Sixth: October 2, 1952, evening session.

Cleveland, Ohio:

- Seventh: October 6, 1952, morning session.
- Eighth: October 6, 1952, evening session.

Detroit, Mich.:

- Ninth: October 7, 1952, morning session.
- Tenth: October 7, 1952, evening session.

Chicago, Ill.:

- Eleventh: October 8, 1952, morning session.
- Twelfth: October 8, 1952, evening session.
- Thirteenth: October 9, 1952, morning session.
- Fourteenth: October 9, 1952, evening session.

St. Paul, Minn.:

- Fifteenth: October 10, 1952, morning session.
- Sixteenth: October 10, 1952, evening session.

St. Louis, Mo.:

- Seventeenth: October 11, 1952, morning session.
- Eighteenth: October 11, 1952, evening session.

San Francisco, Calif.:

- Nineteenth: October 14, 1952, morning session.
- Twentieth: October 14, 1952, evening session.

Los Angeles, Calif.:

- Twenty-first: October 15, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-second: October 15, 1952, evening session.

Atlanta, Ga.:

- Twenty-third: October 17, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-fourth: October 17, 1952, evening session.

Washington, D. C.:

- Twenty-fifth: October 27, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-sixth: October 27, 1952, evening session.
- Twenty-seventh: October 28, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-eighth: October 28, 1952, evening session.
- Twenty-ninth: October 29, 1952, mornings session.
- Thirtieth: October 29, 1952, evening session.

Appendix: Special studies.

Indexes:

- Persons heard or who submitted statements by session and order of appearance.
- Organizations represented by persons heard or by submitted statements.
- Persons heard or who submitted statements by alphabetical arrangement of names.
- Subject matter.

(Page numbers may be obtained from indexes)

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1952

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

ST. LOUIS, MO.

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization met at 1:30 p. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 1, New Federal Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Philip B. Perlman, chairman, presiding.

Present: Chairman Philip B. Perlman and the following Commissioners: Msgr. John O'Grady, Mr. Thomas G. Finnecane, Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson.

Also present: Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will come to order.

Is Mr. Marvin Rich here?

STATEMENT OF MARVIN RICH, REPRESENTING TEAMSTERS AND CHAUFFEURS LOCAL 688 OF THE AFL

Mr. RICH. I am Marvin Rich, 1127 Pine, St. Louis, Mo. I am research analyst for the Teamsters and Chauffeurs Local 688 of the A. F. L., which I am representing here.

I have a statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mr. RICH. The question of immigration policy in 1952 is inevitably linked in the minds of many Americans with the cold war which is being waged with international communism.

Throughout the nineteenth century America won a place in the hearts of millions in Europe as the refuge of the oppressed, who fled from religious, racial, and political persecution.

In the 1920's primarily for economic reasons, we restricted immigration. Since then America has learned much about the operation of an economy for full employment.

Regulation of the flow of immigration to suit the economic facts of life is wise. Yet today America is unnecessarily risking good will and damaging the cause of democracy in the eyes of the world by its new immigration policy. The introduction of factors such as race and religion into this policy are particularly reprehensible.

The proposals that follow are not our ideal proposals. Rather they are a compromise between the most desirable and the most realizable.

1. The total number of immigrants allowed to enter the country in any one year should be a fixed percentage of the total population. The use of some arbitrary figure, such as 154,000 cannot be defended, as our population increases and our economy expands. If a percentage were used there would be at least a rough approximation of immigration with the ability of our economy to absorb the immigrants.

During the period from 1925 to 1930, the ratio of immigration to population was 25 per 10,000. In previous periods the ratio was much higher—going as high as 141 per 10,000 from 1847 to 1854. That is the peak period for the time we have been keeping those figures. If the present immigration quota of some 154,000 were completely used the ratio of immigration to population would be about 10 per 10,000 the first year and would gradually decline.

2. The most recent available census information should be used to determine both the over-all quota and the quota for each country. This is more realistic than using some arbitrary date (such as 1920 or 1950) which will soon become obsolescent, and saying the composition of our country ought to remain the same as it was at that period. Using more recent data would allow for a gradual shift to meet changing world conditions.

3. If the system of national origins, which is not desirable in that it implies a sense of self-satisfaction and of superiority on our part, is used at all it should be used throughout. There should be no deviation from the system of national origins to discriminate against Asiatics who reside in other parts of the world. This portion of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is sheer racism which cannot be defended before science, our own ideals, or the people of the world. It is not only arrogant. It is stupid. We cannot afford to accept the concept of "inferior races."

4. Unused quotas should be pooled and used the following year. This would allow a certain flexibility for differential economic conditions throughout the world and would not impair our economy in any way, if the first proposal I mentioned was adopted, since the total number of immigrants would not exceed the ratio determined in advance as sound.

5. Colonies should be allowed to use the quota of the proprietor country. It appears that the only purpose in establishing separate quotas for colonies was to cut off the predominantly Negro immigration from the West Indies. This serves no useful purpose in terms of our economy and hurts us in our international relations—not only with the peoples of the Caribbean but also with the rest of the darker-skinned peoples of the world.

6. There should be a time limit on the deportability of aliens. We cannot take exception with the limit of 5 years set in the previous statute. In periods of economic stress many aliens who have had a long history of economic responsibility may become public charges. It does not seem just to make such people return to their native land for conditions over which they have relatively little control.

7. The provisions of the new Immigration Act allowing all immigrants to become citizens are desirable. In our country there should not be any least favored who are deemed to be unfit for citizenship.

Asiatic immigration deserves much more consideration than it has been given in the past. The greatest failure of America to win friends

has probably been in the Orient. The prohibitions respecting oriental immigration were used as propaganda by the Japanese militarists in building up hatred for America in the generation before World War II. That propaganda is now being continued by Soviet Russia.

In summation, we urge consideration of a policy of immigration that discards all factors except the economic repercussions which may result. People should be considered as individuals. We should not judge the prospective American citizen born abroad on the basis of the color of his skin, or eyes, or hair, or of his religion. We should consider only the contribution he can make to America.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Rich, one of the statements made frequently in connection with discussions of immigration relates to the competitive nature between new immigrants and people already here who are in the labor market. Would you have any comments on that?

Mr. RICH. Yes; a couple of things. I think real wages in the last generation or more have increased from about 25 to 35 percent. It is true that our immigration has been greatly restricted during this period. Nonetheless, it has been large, at least during the early part. We have managed to do a job. Population and even a large labor force does not necessarily mean a loss in real wages. It is the initiative we have, our ability to utilize that labor force, which is important.

I think this is the position of our union: that immigration does not in and of itself adversely affect the work. The problem is, What can the economy do to absorb and utilize that immigration? It is a different question.

The CHAIRMAN. Do your people have seniority rights that couldn't be disturbed by any new labor?

Mr. RICH. That is true, and as the new immigrant comes in he would be part of that seniority system in his shop.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mrs. E. V. Cowdry here?

STATEMENT OF MRS. E. V. COWDRY, REPRESENTING THE ST. LOUIS YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION AND THE YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF MISSOURI

Mrs. COWDRY. I am Mrs. E. V. Cowdry, 1411 Locust Street, St. Louis. I am representing the St. Louis Young Women's Christian Association, of whose public affairs committee I am a member, and the Young Women's Christian Association public-affairs committee of Missouri, of which I am chairman.

I have a prepared statement I should like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mrs. COWDRY. The Young Women's Christian Association of the United States, by vote of its 1952 national convention which was composed of delegates from St. Louis and 367 other communities, adopted a public-affairs program which included the following statement:

We continue to support an immigration policy which is based not only on our own needs as a nation but upon human welfare, and also to work for free immigration and naturalization laws that are free from racial discrimination.

As a world-wide, as well as a national and local, organization the YWCA is greatly concerned with the problems of refugees—especially women and children—in those countries which are suffering from overpopulation caused by war and by changing of national boundaries. The World's YWCA Council, meeting in Lebanon in October of last year, decided that the work with refugees, started as emergency work, should become part of the regular program. Inevitably this means that the YWCA members, especially young adults, in many countries will be increasingly aware of the problems and needs of women and girls in countries like Germany, Austria, Lebanon, Korea, and India where there are thousands of homeless persons. A most important need, in addition to adequate shelter, food, and so forth, is confidence on the part of other members of the World's YWCA in the American association just as the world needs to have confidence in the United States. Immigration and naturalization laws which eliminate existing racial discrimination and provide for the pooling of unused quotas would do much toward strengthening this confidence.

My husband and I were in India this year where he was making a survey of cancer research for the Indian Government. We saw literally hundreds of thousands of refugees in Karachi and in the large cities of India and realized in part the problems of such masses of people in distress. We read accounts of instances of racial discrimination in the United States which were headlined by many of the Indian newspapers.

The Communists and intense Nationalists never lost an opportunity to point out that we, in the States talk democracy and practice discrimination.

Incidentally, in Bombay, I worked several days a week in the women's rehabilitation depot—a shop run by Indians, under Government sponsorship, which sold articles made by refugees and destitute women and girls in the refugee camps.

We saw the grain for India program the point 4 program, the Technological Cooperation Administration, the technical assistance program of the U. N.—all of which, in limited degrees, demonstrate the concern of the American people for helping other countries help themselves. Changes which would liberalize our immigration policies are another needed step toward building confidence in us.

Although for many years the YWCA has worked to secure equal treatment for all people, it is becoming more and more aware of this responsibility through contacts with students and other visitors observing American life and with populations of other countries visited by American members. That is why, even here in St. Louis, though somewhat more removed from first-hand contact with numbers of new immigrants, we, in the YWCA have some understanding of the tensions and fears of those who live nearer the east, west, and southern coasts.

We appreciate this opportunity to express our strong conviction that we need in this country an immigration policy based not only upon our own needs but upon human welfare; and immigration and naturalization laws free from racial discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Our next witness will be Mr. Nicholas Potje.

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS POTJE, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN AID SOCIETY OF ST. LOUIS

Mr. POTJE. I am Nicholas Potje, 3147 Merrimac, St. Louis, Mo. I represent the American Aid Society of St. Louis.

I would like to make a few observations based on my experience in the refugee field with the American Aid Society.

My idea is this: Let a certain amount come over. In other words, a certain amount of people in Germany, Austria, or whatever it is and whoever wants to come over, let them come over; that is, those who are willing to work. In other words, we cannot set a quota of 150,000. Maybe you have 160,000 who like to come over to this country, and why let the 10,000 stay over there who would like to come over here? In other words, if you have room for 150,000 you should have room for 160,000.

A lot of people are driven away from their homes. People born and raised in some of those countries were hard workers and in their ways of living, and all of a sudden were driven away from their homes. Nobody wanted them and they were put in a country where nobody much cared for them. If they still have that much courage after having been down and out on their feet altogether and still have hopes to come back on their feet and there is a chance for us to help those people and we can do charity to those people, I think we should help them regardless of whether it is 150,000 or 160,000. I wouldn't slight the 10,000 or 15,000 people. Why set a quota at a certain amount and leave the other ones over there? It's just those types of people with strength and will who want to go, after losing everything, to different parts of the world, to get up on their feet and come back to it. Regardless of what color or what they are I think those should be given a chance to come over and to make their home up here again.

It is just like when this country had, say, about 50,000 or 60,000 inhabitants. This country wasn't built only on those 50,000. There is always more and more added to make this country strong. There is always more workers and they develop more. That is like if you have a front and if you don't reinforce that front naturally you get weak. I think if we help those people over there who need help—I think we should do something and help those people, give them another chance and bring them back to this country so they can start up again and be happy and successful just like they have been over there. Quite a few are in Germany and some in Austria and some in Italy. I don't know much about the eastern part or what is going on up there.

In the last 7 or 8 years when this American Aid Society and these DP's and refugees came I have been working with them right along, and I have seen what took place. I think we should help all those who need help at the present time.

Mr. ROSENFELD. How many DP's and/or expellees did you settle, sir?

Mr. POTJE. I wouldn't know, sir. You see, you set a quota for 150,000 and suppose there are 160,000 like to come over. I think the Government has got a quota number of people over there. Thousands over there would like to come over. I would like all to come over who are willing to come over here.

The CHAIRMAN. That might be a million people.

Mr. POTJE. Yes, it is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Or two million people.

Mr. POTJE. That is true, but there is not a million refugees over there I don't think, sir.

Mr. ROSENFELD. You mean refugees.

Mr. POTJE. Yes, that is what I am talking about; those driven away from their homes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is more than that if you take the actual number of displaced persons and refugees and expellees and escapees. It would run into several million.

Mr. POTJE. That is true. I grant you that, but not all want to come over. Well, say a certain amount of quota, whatever the Government sees fit to come over and just give them a chance to come over.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you couldn't take them all.

Mr. POTJE. No, I guess not. Then, for instance, if a farmer comes over, let him be a farmer and stay on the farm, you see, and then the farmer should pay a certain amount of his salary and he should not go to the farm and come back to the city. If they volunteer to go to the farm they should stay there for a year or so and those coming to the city should stay in the city.

I think that is just about all I can say.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. W. A. Peter, representing the German-American Societies for Omaha, Nebr., was scheduled to be here but Mr. Rosenfield has received a message from him.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Peter of Omaha has notified us he was unable to get a plane. He says he will try to appear at the Washington hearings and will write to the Commission regarding the exact time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Dr. Homer C. Bishop here?

STATEMENT OF HOMER C. BISHOP, REPRESENTING THE ST. LOUIS CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

Dr. BISHOP. I am Homer C. Bishop, 8913 Madge Avenue, Brentwood, Mo. I am associate professor of social work at the George Warren Brown School of Social Work of Washington University.

I am appearing here in behalf of the St. Louis chapter of the American Association of Social Workers.

I have a statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mr. BISHOP. It should be made clear at the outset that we are not experts in the analysis of legislation nor in the administration of immigration policies. Even if we were, I suspect the very length and complexity of Public Law 414 would tend to humble us in any attempt to discuss it before the public. However, a review of the major aspects of the act "brings us up short" and, whether as citizens or social workers or both, directs our attention to a consideration of some of our basic beliefs.

We would like, therefore, in this statement to propose some principles to be considered either in evaluating existing legislation or drafting new laws to regulate immigration and naturalization. In doing this we will be on sounder ground than if we attempted any direct assessment of Public Law 414. We recognize that considerations of immigration policy must keep one eye on our Nation's ability to absorb

newcomers. We do believe, however, that the other must be kept on conditions prevailing in those parts of the world from which people wish to emigrate. Our ability to absorb is not fixed or absolute in extent. Our recent history as a nation—in fact, all of our history—is a parade of events in which we rose and successfully met challenges that the more timid among us said we could not do. In 1952 and in 1955 and 1960 we must consider honestly the plight of the “wretched refuse” and the “homeless tempest-tossed” abounding in our world before we decide how many we can absorb.

There is one other general observation I would like to make. The profession of social work and the American concept of social welfare are based on firm belief in the individual's ability to grow in his capacity to deal with life's problems. He cannot be condemned forever because of a mistake, a misfortune, or a bad judgment. The crippled and maimed have become self-supporting, the delinquent have become reliable citizens, the unemployed have taken their places in the ranks of the workers, and the aged have found new hope and usefulness. Not all of them to be sure. But in sufficient numbers that we can never again write them off as millstones around our necks or spare any effort to share and help them with their burden. We believe that any measures which lead to harsh and arbitrary prejudgment of people desiring to take their place in our midst violate not only American standards of fair play but ignore what we know about man.

Now to be a little more specific. Any legislation which reflects in any way the now completely discredited ideas of racial superiorities and inferiorities is out of place in today's scene. Measures which either directly or ultimately are discriminatory or preferential belie our position in the world of freedom and freedom of ideas. Whatever the rate of immigration, it must be applied with equity to all men without regard for race or national origin.

We believe that an individual's eligibility for admission to the United States should not be jeopardized by an act of his government or of other citizens of his native land. Whatever the criteria to be used in selection—and there must be some—each person must be judged on his own merits and not of his countrymen.

We are firmly opposed to any measures which make retroactive new grounds for deportation. Ex post facto laws are appearing at more points than deportation and naturalization. We must not threaten the future and the security of those who emigrate to our shores by forcing them to live under a cloud of anxiety that some past act will suddenly become a cause for deportation.

There are other aspects of our legal system that ought not be violated in our dealings with immigrants, aliens, and naturalized citizens: Fair hearings in which all parties may be represented by competent counsel, may cross-examine witnesses, may present witnesses, and may know exactly what are the charges and the evidence against them; judicial review in which both administrator and applicants may have the protection of impartial and open consideration of administrative decision; and adherence to the concept of due process. This keystone of our individual liberties is as essential for one man as for another if it is to have value for any. We do not profess to be lawyers, but we have come to realize that in some way these concepts lie close to the heart of the American way of life. Without them we have little

to offer the free world. We cannot set them aside in our dealings with a few men without risking their loss to all men.

And similarly we suggest that legislation pertaining to immigration and naturalization must reflect our long-standing belief in the freedom of thought, discussion, and assembly. It must take in account realistic dangers due to subversives, but it cannot move us closer to those totalitarian methods which we claim to abhor. There is a far-reaching difference between "one who is proved to be" and "one who is thought to be." The law must not make possible summary action by any official.

As social workers, we have a special concern. Immigration measures should be designed so as to facilitate keeping families together. We know from our daily work the essential worth of family life. We also know of the heartaches resulting from families torn apart by what seem sometimes to be the vagaries of immigration laws. Our social scientists have sketched the prime value of a satisfactory family experience as preparation for participation in the American democratic system. This preparation should not be denied those who are otherwise eligible to migrate to this country.

In conclusion, it seems to us that immigration and naturalization laws and policies ought to be the following:

1. An aid rather than a barrier to a reasonable flow of people to our shores and to our fellowship in democracy.

2. An embodiment of our convictions about human rights, civil liberties, and legal processes that implement our belief in the worth of the individual.

3. An intelligent and compassionate use of the admissible number of immigrants recognizing the plight of the troubled peoples of the world and the tremendous responsibility for leadership that has been thrust upon us.

Thank you for providing this opportunity for our Association to appear before you and present our views and our beliefs.

MR. ROSENFELD. Professor Bishop, in your statement you say: "Whatever the rate of immigration, it must be applied with equity to all men without regard for race or national origin." Do you present that to the Commission in terms of your professional knowledge and background as to the ready absorption of all peoples of all national origins into the United States? In other words, can people of all races or national origins be absorbed in the United States from your knowledge of people?

DR. BISHOP. All races would not be accepted and absorbed in the same way with the same willingness and at the same rate. I am quite sure of that. But I think we ought to strive to set up our legislation in such a way that we make it possible; that we do not freeze into the system elements which existed 20 or 5 years ago or may exist today.

MR. ROSENFELD. Are you saying that some people can assimilate more easily in the United States than others?

DR. BISHOP. I think that my hunch would be that it is because of the situation in the United States, and not because of any inherent differences in these various immigrants.

THE CHAIRMAN. Let's assume for the purpose of the question that from a scientific viewpoint there are no real differences in race. Is it to the best interest of the United States to admit everybody on that basis?

Dr. BISHOP. I would say in terms of our responsibility now as a world leader and the kind of nation we are going to have to be if we are going to have anything near like the world we want, we will have to admit them on that basis and work out the problems of adjustments as they come. I don't think that is the critical problem, helping them to adjust. I think we have got to think in terms of the welfare of the world now and not just how are we going to get along here between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. That day is gone and if we think in terms of the world-wide welfare, then we will of necessity come out with a different answer about who can adjust and who can adjust to what and how much can we absorb.

Commissioner FINUCANE. But you agree, don't you, that the people admitted into our country should be integrated?

Dr. BISHOP. That raises two questions. One, What is the rate of immigration? We recognize there has to be some control of that and I think we have the techniques for determining how that might be arrived at. Not many years ago we had a serious problem in determining policy with regard to atomic energy and some of our American citizens were gathered together and they did a tremendous job in arriving at a policy. I think we could apply the same technique to immigration and use facts and scientific truths in arriving at it rather than the free play of political forces.

Secondly, you have got to help them adjust. We have been doing that for 150 years. Part of my work has been in the lower north side district of Chicago.

But immigration should not be determined on the basis of other problems we have. It should be determined on policy with its own merits.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Dr. Bishop do you think that our relationship in the world problems of today is so acute and so important that it might be advisable to set up a much smaller over-all number for admissions in order to be completely equitable toward all the peoples of the earth?

Dr. BISHOP. I deal daily with students from many foreign lands: Germany, India, Israel, Belgium, and South America. This kind of situation, how we act toward them, rankles. It takes considerable time to work through that and to get them to understand a little bit about the situation so they are free to talk with me and listen in our classes freely and openly. I wouldn't want to answer your question "Yes" if it was to be interpreted that I said we should have smaller quotas. If that is the only way we can have fair quotas, then maybe we should have smaller ones, but I want everything else I said about looking at the world's problems and seeing what is our fair share taken into that account. We make that kind of decision personally every day of our lives. The community chest wants us to make a contribution. The question is, How much should I give? Who can I turn to to ask how much I should give? It is my conscience who tells me. If it is quite bad I am likely to give \$5 more. There is no formula. I have looked for one. It just isn't there.

That is somewhat our position now. How do we share this problem? And for a direct answer: If that is the only way we can get a fair share then make them smaller. I would not like to see them smaller.

Mr. ROSENFELD. As I understand, are you as a teacher of social workers saying to the Commission that the facts of life are that some groups will be assimilated more quickly than others, but in the over-all picture you, as a social worker, are not concerned that they want to make the ultimate adjustment to the American scene?

Dr. BISHOP. That is correct, as I understand your question.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the problem of assimilation is not a vital problem in the long run?

Dr. BISHOP. Not in the least.

I was thinking as I got ready to come here about some of my own background. I can remember the boys I played football with in high school and the boys I was on the swimming team with. There were Japanese, Jewish, Polish, Negroes, Germans, and so forth, and they, so far as I know, are all fine citizens today. Some of them had harder times than others.

The CHAIRMAN. What town was that?

Dr. BISHOP. Kenosha, Wis. It is a small industrial city just above Chicago. A large percentage of the foreign population was engaged in the industries. We grew up together. We knew it wasn't as easy for some as for others.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think a system of admission of immigration should contain the factor of race?

Dr. BISHOP. I would not make the fact of race a factor in admitting or refusing to admit any human being.

Commissioner O'GRADY. How about nationality?

Dr. BISHOP. If nationality is necessary in order to have some kind of regulation, then we may have to go along with it provided you stick to nationality and not use it to play around to get the kind of selection you want, because sometimes by controlling nationality you control racial elements. Sometimes you don't. To say that a man is born in England who has a Chinese mother must come under the Chinese quota is not a national quota: it is a racial kind of quota. I would be quite content to have him come on the English quota if he is an English citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think of the situation where a quota is quite regularly unused, as in the case of England?

Dr. BISHOP. I think that is very unfair. I am not willing to go on and say that it was set up that way because of somebody's prejudice, but it is unfair whatever the reason. In October 1952 it is unfair.

Mr. ROSENFELD. What would you propose as a method for using these unused quotas?

Dr. BISHOP. Well, just off the top of my head, I would think that there ought to be enough flexibility that some officially designated group could take that and use it in this way I suggested; an intelligent, compassionate way to share the burdens of the world and not be harnessed to a law that does not allow them that flexibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Is Mr. Paul B. Rava here?

STATEMENT OF PAUL B. RAVA, REPRESENTING THE ITALIAN CLUB, THE COLUMBIAN SOCIETY, AND THE ITALIAN WAR VETERANS OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. RAVA. I am Paul B. Rava, an attorney, 705 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

I represent the Italian Club, the Columbian Society, and the Italian War Veterans of St. Louis, Mo.

I have a brief statement which, with your permission, Dr. Homer C. Bishop will read for me, owing to difficulty I am having with my voice.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear it.

Mr. RAVA (as read by Dr. Homer C. Bishop). I am a member of the Missouri bar, admitted before the Supreme Court of the United States and before the Board of Immigration Appeals. My statement is made on behalf of the Italian Club, of the Italian War Veterans, and of the Columbian Society, which is an association of sixteen civic and fraternal societies of St. Louis.

It is my privilege to represent before this honorable Commission the point of view of this large group of American citizens of Italian origin or extraction concerning our immigration laws.

We shall consider this complex problem in a spirit of objectivity and fairness, in full confidence in the principles of morality and justice which have motivated the basic policies of our country of adoption.

From the Declaration of Independence to the Atlantic Charter and to the United Nations, equality and dignity of men, irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin have been the ethical foundation of our legal and social system at home and of our foreign policy abroad. These are not pious expressions of good will, but the formulation of those great truths which bring forth and energize the best traits in the human race, and which made this country the moral leader of the free world.

But adherence to these principles is impeached and weakened by the reaffirmance in the 1952 immigration and naturalization law of quotas which discriminate against certain nationalities. Among these is Italy, the largest country in continental Europe west of the Rhine. The restrictive provisions against Italian immigration are inconsistent with the ethical premise of our constitutional dogmas.

In addition to the all-important moral issue, we are concerned with the economic reasons which militate in favor of liberalizing our immigration laws. The tremendous economic expansion of this country was due to a considerable extent to the great immigrational influx. The rise of our population from 4 million to 150 million, and the corresponding phenomenal economic growth of this country is largely the result of immigration. The forecast for our population in 1970 is 170 million people, whereas that of the Soviet Union is 251 million. We should consider seriously the problems of our growth and productivity.

History has shown that Italian immigration has been rapidly absorbed in this country, to the mutual benefit of Italy, which is burdened by overpopulation, and of the United States. Italian immigrants have brought many skills to this country: tailors, miners, farmers, terrazzo workers, are still in demand, some in increasing de-

mand. Among the scientists the names of Enrico Fermi, Bruno Rossi, and Emilio Serge are known to all of us, because of their leading part in the atomic field.

The McCarran Act deprives college professors of the nonquota classification which they enjoyed under the old law. Under the new system none of these great scientists would be likely to find admission here through the ordinary quotas. Incidentally, this policy is in conflict with our leading position in UNESCO and the free exchange of cultural information to which UNESCO is dedicated.

Again directing our attention to the economic reasons, Italian professional men and businessmen who immigrated here have created working opportunities for themselves and others. To make one illustration, let me refer to the Italian Club of St. Louis. Its 40 members are all American citizens, even though more than 90 percent were born in Italy. Of them 28 own their independent businesses, in which some 400 people are gainfully employed. Of the remaining 12, 6 are professional men who employ their own help. Only six are employed by others, and these in a managerial capacity.

This Commission is too well acquainted with the demographic and unemployment situation of Italy to make it necessary to recite appurtenant statistics, which I am sure are already in your files. The two crucial figures are 2,000,000 unemployed and 450,000 yearly increase in population.

We are not suggesting that a liberalized immigration policy of the United States by itself would solve this problem. But remedial legislation by our Congress would point the way for other countries, such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand to do their part in the resettlement of surplus population.

Free Europeans living under substandard economic conditions constitute an element of weakness in the striving democratic institutions of our outpost across the Atlantic. Immediate and long-range strategic and economic considerations all point to the same conclusion. Let America take the lead in solving this crucial problem.

We respectfully urge the Commission to recommend the adoption of legislation of the type formulated in H. R. 7376 and S. 3109, and to permit the utilization of at least half of the unused quotas by countries whose quotas are oversubscribed.

APPENDIX A. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

Italian Club of St. Louis.

Italian War Veterans of St. Louis.

Columbian Society, which is an association of the following 16 societies:

Campobello di Mazara

La Misericordia

San Giuseppe

Italo-American Mutual Society

St. Fara and Mazzara del Vallo

Citta' di Marsala

Unione and Fratellanza Italiana

Vincenzo Bellini

Megara Augusta

G. Marconi

Amore and Vits

Casteltermini

La Pace

Loggia Iccardi

St. Anna

St. Elena

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. RAVA, under the bill that you favor, H. R. 7376, that bill would give Italy 39,000 a year for 3 years as an additional quota—that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. RAVA. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that if that were done that would do any substantial good in relieving the overpopulation in Italy?

Mr. RAVA. We make a twofold proposition. That is one, and the other is to use half of the unused quotas of the countries which don't use their full quota, and make them available in the same ratio to the countries whose quota is oversubscribed.

The CHAIRMAN. How many would that add?

Mr. RAVA. Well, I haven't made the mathematical computation, but it would be something in the nature of between 30,000 and 35,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you would give Italy one-half of all the unused quotas?

Mr. RAVA. No, I didn't say that—make it available in a pool to those countries which have an oversubscribed quota, and use those in the same ratio as the quotas for those countries has been determined. In other words, if there are 100,000 people from the English quota, and other quotas which are not subscribed make that 100,000 available in the same ratio to those countries whose quota is oversubscribed.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the population of Italy?

Mr. RAVA. In excess of 47 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any information to indicate how many people can be properly supported in Italy?

Mr. RAVA. Well, the unemployment statistics, I believe, are perhaps the best answer. There are 2 million unemployed in Italy at the present time, and, in addition, there are at least 2 million only partially employed whose economic standards could be according to average construction substantially—

The CHAIRMAN. That is 4 million.

Mr. RAVA. Well, one could rationalize and triple it. I was considering the—

The CHAIRMAN. That's how many?

Mr. RAVA. That would be 3 million.

The CHAIRMAN. You said 2 and 2—that makes 4 million.

Mr. RAVA. Two are only partially employed, and apply a sort of rule of thumb.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that include the Italians who are expellees, or refugees?

Mr. RAVA. That includes the Italians who are expellees; they are being reabsorbed, some of them have made marvelous strides in finding jobs for themselves; those who came from North Africa, Africa, and other parts.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if, as you say, Italy has a surplus population of approximately 3 million, what good would it do to take 100,000 or 200,000?

Mr. RAVA. Well, our point is that it would be of great value because there are other countries which would be likely to follow the example of the United States, even the present emigration in Italy today is in excess of 150,000 a year—they go to various countries, there are agreements with Argentina, with Brazil, with other South Americans and Central Americans. Traditionally, many Italians have worked in

France and in Switzerland—that is temporary emigration as distinguished from permanent emigration. They go there to work in the winter season or summer season, according to the various places. However, there are now about 150,000 emigrants every year. In addition, an opening of the immigration policy in the United States would have a great effect upon such countries as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and perhaps South Africa.

I think that the leading position that the United States has at the present time is such that if the United States adopts a policy which is more restrictive than the previous policy, the effect would be to induce those other countries to take restrictive measures; certainly, not to liberalize their policy. I believe that what the United States can do is not only make available so many working opportunities here, say 150,000, but that would work as an example in setting a precedent for other countries to follow the same example.

I think it is very difficult for the United States representative at the Intergovernmental Committee for Movement of Migrants from Europe to make proposals toward inducing other countries to lessen their restrictions when at home the United States is embarking on a policy which is to some extent racially controlled, and restrictively inclined, and I think that weakens the position of any leader and any diplomatic representative of the United States in any form of international agreement.

Now there is a tremendous movement in Europe toward achieving a European Federation—the progress is very real and very substantial. However, one of the big obstacles to the Economic Federation and Political Federation of Europe is that in certain areas you have this surplus population, and if some of it could be absorbed elsewhere, in the New World, as they call it, I think even the possibility of an Economic and Political Federation of Europe would be considerably increased.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Rava.

Mr. RAVA. May I ask the leave of the Commission 1 second. Chancellor Arthur H. Compton, of the Washington University of St. Louis, was unable to be present, and he asked that I present to the Commission a letter he has sent. Would that be possible?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. His letter will be read into the record by Mr. Rosenfield.

(The letter of Chancellor Arthur H. Compton, Washington University, read into the record by Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, follows:)

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELOR,
St. Louis, October 11, 1952.

To the Person Before Whom Hearings Are To Be Held Regarding Revision of Immigration Laws.

DEAR SIR: I wish to testify relative to the change in the Federal law which eliminates professors in colleges and universities from the status of nonquota immigrants. I refer to House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, second session, Report No. 1365, page 101, accompanying H. R. 5678, where comparison with the "existing law" shows that this category of nonquota immigrants is omitted in the proposed law.

I desire to make two points:

1. Professors admitted on a nonquota basis have performed services to the United States of extraordinary value, and the elimination of them in the future will correspondingly cause our Nation unnecessary harm. As evidence, I may

state, as of my first-hand knowledge, that without the services of Enrico Fermi, who came from Rome to be professor at Columbia University, Eugene Wigner, who came from Budapest to be professor at Princeton, and Edward Teller, of Budapest, who came as professor at Columbia, the United States would not and could not have produced the atomic bomb in time to have been of value in World War II. In many other ways also the recently immigrated scientists were of substantial help during World War II. In the case just cited, their help to our Nation was decisive.

2. In the judgment of those Americans best qualified, the professors who have recently been admitted on nonquota visas have been found to be citizens of exceptional value to the Nation. As evidence, I may call attention to the fact that during the past 10 years an extraordinarily large number of recently immigrated professors have been elected to the National Academy of Sciences. This is of especial significance because this body is charged with the responsibility for advising the United States Government regarding scientific matters affecting the Nation's welfare. The members of the Academy take this responsibility seriously as they elect new members. There is no body more competent than are these men to judge the value to the Nation of their professorial colleagues, and their judgment regarding the recent immigrants is strongly favorable.

I should add that in my considered judgment other provisions of the bill known as H. R. 5678 are also seriously damaging to the Nation's safety and welfare, to such an extent that in my opinion it would be preferable to retain the previous law.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR H. COMPTON.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. H. M. Ramel here?

STATEMENT OF HUBERT M. RAMEL, MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE NATIONAL METAL TRADES, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. RAMEL. I am Herbert M. Ramel, vice president of the Ramsey Corp., of St. Louis, Mo. This is a subject that is a little afield from my endeavors. I am presently on the executive board of the National Metal Trades, the National Association of Manufacturers, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, Associated Industries of Missouri, and I have been, and I am presently, industry member of the Regional Labor Management Committee of Kansas City. I have also been the industry member of the International Labor Organization. I presume maybe the latter has caused me to be thrown into immigration. Frankly, I don't know too much about it. I haven't had much opportunity to form any definite opinions upon the old law or the new law.

We did have a problem in Kansas City here about a year or so ago when we ran into the problem of wetbacks from Mexico, but I don't think that was too serious, especially as it only affected the lower part of our State.

If there are any questions that I might be asked I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Ramel, the purpose of the invitation of the Commission to you was to inquire of you not so much as to the technicalities of the immigration law, past and present, as to inquire of you as to the needs of industry, if any, in this general area. What is the general manpower situation? Have the people in industry in this area been able to obtain the people they have needed for their work?

Mr. RAMEL. Generally speaking, we have; St. Louis has never been considered a tight area. I think in our whole region the only area

that we had any real difficulty with was Wichita. Now I can speak with some authority on that because that was the only place that we even set up an area committee, outside of Kansas City and Kansas City was set up primarily because of the flood rather than of any acute shortage in labor.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Has there been a real shortage in Wichita?

Mr. RAMEL. Yes. Wichita has a problem because of the large aircraft production in Wichita.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Has there been a large influx of workers there?

Mr. RAMEL. Yes, there has, and they have been trying to get more, but it has been mostly technical help, as I understand it, rather than that of the less unskilled labor.

Mr. ROSENFELD. How have they met then the needs in that area?

Mr. RAMEL. Well, they have gotten—I happen to know a couple of personnel managers down there, and they seem to have satisfied their needs. I don't think they are too far behind on their quota, so they have gotten them from highways and byways, they have sought other cities, they have attempted to bring them in from the other various places when they could get them, going into other areas. I know we have had some difficulty, at least on one occasion, where they have come into this area, where it has caused some confusion.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Have they been recruiting?

Mr. RAMEL. Yes; they have been recruiting. That is the only area where there is a problem I know of in this region, and that takes in five States.

Mr. ROSENFELD. What use has been made within the general area, particularly in the railway centers of the Mexican migrant labor?

Mr. RAMEL. Right in this immediate area, we haven't had much Mexican labor. I think you will find possibly up around Kansas City there is some, but in this general area, I am of the opinion that it is not universally used.

Commissioner O'GRADY. What States are in this region or area?

Mr. RAMEL. Well, there is Nebraska, Kansas, Arkansas, Missouri, and I think Oklahoma—I am not certain of that—no, Iowa.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Is there a labor shortage in Omaha?

Mr. RAMEL. Omaha was on the verge of it, but not too bad.

We have been on the verge of shortage on about three different occasions—we are running into one now. There are anticipations that in this region we may have some acute shortages, but at the present time, no. As a matter of fact, the Labor Management Committee hasn't had a meeting since last spring.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Is the labor supply here the subject of any planning in anticipation of possible shortages?

Mr. RAMEL. We here in the Middle West are not as conscious of the labor supply as from the same viewpoint that might be had from, say, the East and the Far West, or even the South, especially around Texas, because there you do run into the immigration problem more. But St. Louis has always been a pretty fair labor market because of its diversification of industry, and I can speak from that because I was on the War Manpower Commission representing industry during that period, and even though we had our problems we always were able to meet our problems in one way or another. On the immigra-

tion end of it, of course, your economists can figure these things up, and your engineers pull out their slide rules, but whether or not they are absolutely correct, I don't know. They may know more about it than I do, and I am not an economist nor am I an engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Ramel.

Mr. John W. Hamilton?

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. HAMILTON, REPRESENTING THE CITIZENS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION OF ST. LOUIS

Mr. HAMILTON. I am John W. Hamilton, representing the Citizens' Protective Association, 3847 West Pine Street, St. Louis, Mo.

I first wish to take exception to the remarks made by Dr. Wagner here this morning. I am a Protestant and he does not represent me. He claims to represent 500,000 Protestants in this area. Only last April before a hearing of the police board here in St. Louis he claimed he represented 600,000—I do not know which is correct. He doesn't represent the Southern Baptists, the Lutherans, he doesn't represent hosts of other Protestants in this city, and I do not feel that he represents the views, wishes, or desires of the vast majority of those who are members of churches connected with the Metropolitan Church Federation.

We fundamentalists do not make common cause with liberal, Christ-denying modernists, who have distorted and perverted the faith once and for all delivered unto the Saints.

I was very deeply shocked to hear the monsignor of the Roman Catholic Church in Des Moines, Iowa, indulge in—whether he knew it or not—Communist propaganda. In giving his definition of discrimination he called our attention to 15 children and 1 apple, and he said that apple must be divided exactly equal.

I am sorry to say that is a parroting of a hackneyed and discredited Communist philosophy: to each according to his needs, and from each according to his abilities, divide up everything, divide up all the wealth among the people. But, of course, that is where this business about "thou shalt not discriminate" which has been added to the Ten Commandments is going to lead us.

The doctrine of equality did not originate with Karl Marx; it came before that with Adam Smith, and the French Revolution that threatened the whole Christian civilization of Europe, liberty, equality, and fraternity. It led them to bloodshed, to chaos, to atheism, and all forms of perversion. Beware, beware, beware of those who scream and cry "equality." God discriminates, all nature discriminates, life itself discriminates. The person who does not discriminate is either a knave or a fool.

Before going on with my own opinions I have a short prepared statement from the Citizens' Protective Association which reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, I represent the Citizens' Protective Association, a group of people interested in and dedicated to the maintenance and extension of the rights, privileges, integrity, heritage, social edicts, and culture of the white race in America. America has done much more than her share in accepting refugees throughout the

years. This is the time to evaluate our policies. St. Louis was first settled by the French; soon after, came the English. The English were not welcomed with open arms by the French and considerable trouble ensued. After the English came the Germans. They were resented and fought for a long time. The Poles, Latts, and Slovaks came next and they received the same treatment. Last on the scene were the Italians.

Yet in spite of all the differences we have in St. Louis today, a amalgamation of the various nationalities from Europe, each national group in its turn proved that it was worthy to be accepted after a long, hard fight. We still have our Dago Hill, yet it would amaze you gentlemen to learn how many members of the second and third generations of Italian descent are marrying Anglo-Saxons and others.

St. Louis has been a melting pot for the members of the white race. One hundred years ago we had a Negro problem, and we still have it today in a far more aggravated form. The early and late settlers in America were Europeans of the white race. They, in spite of national and religious differences, have largely blended together to form the great United States of America. The oriental has been in our midst for many years, but only the exception showed any desire to mongrelize with our white racial stock.

Our forefathers showed great insight into the racial question by passing the Oriental Exclusion Act, which prevented our country from being inundated by the hordes of the yellow race. Prolific breeders, they would, if unlimited immigration had been permitted, have swamped the west coast and gradually swarmed over the entire continent. Yet, these orientals even until this day seek the company of each other and are proud of their race, language, customs, and heritage. However, they remain, and always will remain, an unassimilable minority.

Members of the Negro race were brought here, against their will in many cases, as slaves; sold or bartered by their African chieftains to the slave traders. They were brought to the New World to replace the native American Indian who could not live under slavery. The Negroid race being an inferior people is the only race which thrives under slavery. They became a problem during slavery, but after they were given their freedom became even more of a burden on white society. As the years go by they become an ever-increasing burden on the white community. Having no culture or civilization of their own, and belonging to a race which all history proves is substandard, and uncreative, the Negro seeks by means of the weight of numbers, and political influence to gain the objectives which he was unable to obtain because of lack of ability. Worse than that, many of their leaders, as well as many Negroes themselves, seek a solution to their racial inferiority through a gradual amalgamation of the white race. This fact presents a very definite problem to white society. The white man built every one of the 21 civilizations known to history. Yet, the creative works of the white man have time and again been destroyed through the process of mongrelization with the colored races. Each great civilization of the past, such as the Chinese, Indian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Carthaginian, Grecian, and Roman was destroyed, when the white creators took unto themselves willing colored slaves and concubines, and destroyed their racial heritage.

The history of civilization is the history of the white race. The misguided do-gooders, the mongrelizers, the Marxists, and the Negro leadership seek to throw open the doors of America to the Negroid and Oriental hordes. They completely ignore the fact that each race in its own country has had an equal opportunity to build its own civilization. Yet, after the white man built and verily created a civilization out of the wilderness of North America, the uncreative, parasitical hordes of the colored races sought to descend upon us and devour our substance. All the white man asks is the same seniority rights that the gentleman from local 688 of the Teamsters' Union is so very concerned that his members shall enjoy.

The colored races are at best the imitators of white society. The higher type of the colored races can imitate; the lower type is unable to do even that. Yet, we are urged by the politicians and the preachers to accept them as our equals.

While the native Indians roamed America for countless years, it was the white man who brought civilization to this continent. He built it, and it belongs to him. Now, the vicious conspiracy is to flood America with the dregs of colored society, to lower our standard of living, and pervert our culture, and to destroy our way of life. Is America to be made the dumping ground for this wretched refuse? The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is the wisest possible solution to the problem. It is based on the national antecedents of the population of the United States. What could be fairer, and, to use a much misused term, more "democratic" than that.

According to Rabbi Abraham L. Hartstein, the Boston Jewish Advocate of April 1949, there were only 6,000 Jews in the United States 100 years ago. They did not build the country. They did not aid in conquering the frontiers. They contributed but little, if anything, to the development of America. Why should they demand to be admitted in unprecedented numbers, largely from behind the iron curtain? How are they, and they alone, seemingly able to flee from the tentacles of Soviet Russia? How many Soviet agents are in their midst? I call the attention of the Commission to the report of the Honorable Ed Gossett, Congressman from Texas, which was made in the House of Representatives on July 2, 1947. It contains much factual information concerning the refugee racket being perpetrated on an unsuspecting, generous American Republic.

The Jew remains an unassimilable minority. I also call your attention to the statement by Senator Pat McCarran, of the United States Senate, on January 6, 1950, entitled "Displaced Persons—Facts vs. Fiction." Senator McCarran's Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over immigration legislation, made a detailed and thorough study of the entire situation, and the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is the net result. This bill was overwhelmingly passed by both Houses of Congress after long debate. When it was vetoed by our political President, both Houses of Congress overrode his veto overwhelmingly, and thereby expressed the will of all patriotic American citizens.

There is no need, gentlemen, for this Commission. It, I fear, is the device of political expediency in a flagrant appeal for support from the racial minorities in the coming election. I am interested to note that while the Negro press has viciously attacked the McCarran-Walter

Immigration Act, I do not see one representative of the Negro race here today, though there are some 150,000 in St. Louis. Evidently, they are not concerned enough about this so-called discrimination that we hear so much about to even bother to send one representative to appear before your Commission.

I am quite disturbed that so many of the clergymen that have appeared here today mentioned the economic aspect solely of admitting people from different races, different cultures, different environments, and, as Dr. Wagner would say, 500,000 over a period of 3 years. I do not know whether they are economic materialists, or believe in the doctrine of economic determination—I certainly hope not. I understood that they were religious gentlemen. What they did not consider was the fact that America has its culture, its heritage, its social edicts, its welfare.

America cannot assimilate the racial minorities now within her own border, much less contend with a deluge of unassimilable racial groups which would flood our shores if given the slightest opportunity. Look for yourselves at the formerly fine residential sections in city after city that have been turned into slums by the black plague. Yet, some appear before you and advocate further increases in the Negro population by lowering our immigration laws to admit countless thousands of West Indians and even Africa itself. No matter how many times men say: "All races are the same. All men are equal." That does not make any fact. Two brothers are not equal—no two men are equal; neither are races equal. These men, consciously or otherwise, are enemies of the white race, and all it stands for. Study the high crime rate in our northern cities—among the Negroes in our northern cities, after they have been exposed to education, advancement, and opportunity. Study the results of admitting vast numbers of colored Puerto Ricans to New York City, and find out for yourself what would happen if its floodgates were lowered to color immigration. "Discrimination" some say—if anyone is being discriminated against in America today it is the white man who built our civilization and our culture.

We need no modification or change in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act unless it be to tighten even further the protective walls against Negroid and oriental immigration. The white race in all its glory built and developed America. To attempt to lower our immigration laws, and allow a flood of Asiatics and Negroids to pour into our country is treason in the worst form.

The Citizens' Protective Association wishes to go on record as being unalterably opposed to any changes in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as the present time.

I thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Commissioner GULLIXSON. Mr. Chairman, in the limitation denominational, I presume that it is not understood that Mr. Hamilton speaks for the Lutheran Church or for other theological conservatives.

Mr. HAMILTON. May I answer that, sir. Of course, I do not, sir, but I do wish to bring out that the American Council of Christian Churches, and the National Association of Evangelicals—two large interdenominational agencies, which have nothing to do with the national council because of its modernism, its liberalism, and its even

left-wingism—have broken away and founded their own interdenominational agencies. Both of those organizations at recent conventions have gone on record in support of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

I am a member of a church that is a constituent member of the National Association of Evangelicals. I do not speak for them, however, I just wish to bring this to your attention, and I wish to point out that Dr. Wagner does not speak for all of the Protestants in St. Louis by any manner of means, although he did seem to give the impression that he claimed to be.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mind telling us, Mr. Hamilton, how many members are in the Citizens' Protective Association?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes. Our organization was formed a year and 2 months ago. We have some 225 members in St. Louis, and a membership at large in a number of States. We also have a branch in Tennessee—we publish a bulletin.

The CHAIRMAN. You speak for St. Louis?

Mr. HAMILTON. I speak for the St. Louis group. I have been directed to come here by the executive board of the Citizens' Protective Association. I am not the chairman—I am editor of our monthly publication, the White Sentinel. They asked me to appear before your Commission, and to give our feelings on the situation. We are very strongly in support of Senator McCarran's great work.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Mr. William Sentner here?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM SENTNER, REPRESENTING THE ANTONIA SENTNER DEFENSE COMMITTEE OF DISTRICT 8, UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. SENTNER. I am William Sentner, representing the Antonia Sentner Defense Committee of District 8, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 705 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

I have a prepared statement I wish to read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it deal with the deportation order in the case of Mrs. Antonia Sentner, and is she your wife?

Mr. SENTNER. That's right, sir. I am only using that case to support the position we take with regard to the bill. I might say that our union nationally, which represents about 275,000, people associate themselves basically with the positions in resolution at the convention recently concluded in September, with Monsignor Ligutti with regard to restrictions in the bill. I will be glad to send you a copy of that resolution, but in essence that was their position with regard to the law itself.

I only want to deal with three aspects of it, and I am using this particular case to point it up. I know it well. St. Louis knows it well, and since it is a case in point I thought this Commission might, by its example, show support to a position with regard to the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a case that has received a lot of publicity in this area?

Mr. SENTNER. Yes, sir; and it doesn't lend itself only to this one case, but it lends itself to the application of the bill to 29,000 non-

citizens in the St. Louis area, and it also lends itself to some questions relating to naturalized citizens who come under danger from this law for acts they might have committed prior to their naturalization or entries into the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you going to confine yourself to the recommendations or do you want to read the whole statement?

Mr. SENTNER. It will only take 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; you may read it.

Mr. SENTNER. There are two aspects of our presentation:

1. Ethical, moral, and legal questions raised in the deportation order in the case of Mrs. Antonia Sentner.
2. The family.

THE ANTONIA SENTNER CASE

1. She legally entered the United States at the port of New York, on July 20, 1914, from Yugoslavia. She was 8 years of age upon entry.

2. She filed her petition for naturalization in 1940. Her application was denied by the late United States District Judge Charles B. Davis, on September 2, 1942. Judge Davis' ruling was based on the sole fact that 5 years had not elapsed since Mrs. Sentner had dropped her membership in the Communist Party in 1938.

3. She refiled her application 1945. She was advised by Walter Wolf, chief naturalization officer in St. Louis that he would deny the application and her petition was withdrawn without prejudice in 1946.

4. She was arrested on an order of deportation on September 1, 1949. She was released on a \$2,000 bond and rearrested and held without bail on October 28, 1950. After spending 5 days in jail her release was ordered on a writ of habeas corpus by United States District Judge Ruby M. Hulén.

5. On November 29, 1950, a hearing on the deportation warrant was started in St. Louis. The hearing was recessed almost immediately after opening and was resumed on November 14, 1951. A week later the hearing officer recommended deportation, which recommendation was affirmed by the Assistant Commissioner of Immigration. An appeal was taken to the Board of Immigration Appeals which appeal was heard on May 8, 1952.

6. On September 29, 1952, this appeal was denied. A petition for reversal was filed with Attorney General James F. McGranery on October 6, 1952. I give this merely to indicate how long this hangs over a person's head.

THE ETHICAL AND MORAL ISSUE

In this case, as in others, the person involved has lived in our country since childhood. She was schooled here, reached maturity, and raised a family of citizens. Mrs. Sentner, now 46 years old, has two children 10 and 14 respectively, and a married daughter and four grandchildren.

We must ask, should a law, or its application transcend the moral and ethical rights of human beings? Except for a technical question, Mrs. Sentner is a citizen, having been in our country since 8 years of age. She was educated in Catholic parochial schools. She worked

in factories and as a clerk. She has raised a family, all of whom are citizens. Her husband is a citizen. Her mother, father, and four sisters and brothers are citizens.

Then by what rhyme or reason can Congress decide in 1950, under the law that this Commission is considering, that persons in a certain class may be punishable with a sentence equal to death for joining a legal political party in 1935?

Mrs. Sentner is now subject to deportation for having been a member of the Communist Party from 1935 to 1938. It was legal for an alien to be a member of the Communist Party in 1935, but a crime in 1950. On what moral or ethical basis can a person be subject to deportation in 1950 for a legal act committed in 1935?

THE FAMILY

Our literature, court rulings, airways and press makes much of the sanctity of the home and family as the very foundation of American democracy. What about Mrs. Sentner's home? She was not of age in 1914 when she was brought to our country. She didn't have anything to do with being here. She worked, got married, and raised a family. All during this time she had no reason to suspect that in 1950, Congress would pass an act that would make her subject to deportation for something she had considered legally right in 1935.

What constitutional rights do her minor children have as American citizens. If their mother is deported involuntarily, what shall they do? And what are the constitutional rights of her married daughter and four grandchildren? We only pose these questions for your committee to answer in your recommendation to the President.

Mrs. Sentner's punishment is banishment from her home and adopted land. This punishment is akin to a sentence of death.

The case of Mrs. Sentner is like that of an orphan who is adopted at birth and then torn from their foster parents and banished from their love, affection, and protection for the remainder of their lives.

The McCarran law, as is the McCarran-Walter law, is unjust and cruel and has no place in the laws of a democratic republic. It is fundamentally an antilabor law, as is the Taft-Hartley and Smith Acts, as we show in our exhibit A attached.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In most cases, people involved in naturalization, deportation, and exclusion cases are poor. The Government should establish and finance a public defender for such people.

2. The right of the Attorney General to hold persons subject to deportation without bail must be abolished. A maximum bail of \$500 should be established in all such cases.

3. A statute of limitations must be established or should I say we ought to return to the 5-year statute of limitations so that noncitizens or naturalized citizens and their children are not subject for a lifetime of uncertainty as to their status as citizens or residents of our country.

(Exhibit A, *The Target Is Labor*, a pamphlet issued by the Antonia Sentner Defense Committee of District No. 8, United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, 705 Olive Street, St. Louis 1, Mo., attached.)

Mr. SENTNER. These are our recommendations based upon this particular case of which, of course, there are hundreds of others, now and to come in the country.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Mr. Roy A. Dillon here?

STATEMENT OF ROY A. DILLON, REPRESENTING THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. DILLON. I am Roy A. Dillon, and I am representing the State Personnel Board of Oklahoma of which I am the director, 606 Wright Building, Oklahoma City. I was formerly chairman of the Oklahoma Displaced Persons Commission for about 3 years.

I am a lay member of a committee with the Council of Churches, which is interested in resettling and assisting in the DP program; and, in fact, it has established a fund which I have been administering on DP matters, since the United States Displaced Persons Commission terminated this past August 31. You see, with the termination of the United States Displaced Persons Commission, the local State groups had to take over, so the Council of Churches has taken over, and it has assisted all the way through the program in any way it could.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you speak for the Council of Churches for the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. DILLON. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that council includes how many denominations?

Mr. DILLON. There are 29 officially connected with the national council—there are 29 denominations in that.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Are all 29 located in Oklahoma City?

Mr. DILLON. In the State, I think. You see, it is connected with the 29 major denominations.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dillon, the Commission will be glad to hear any statement that you would care to make as to your views on a proper immigration policy for the United States.

Mr. DILLON. First of all, I should like to mention that as chairman of the State Displaced Persons Commission, I worked closely with all religious groups, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, and the program was highly satisfactory.

In Oklahoma we desperately need farm people and we would like to recommend that some emergency legislation be put in, if possible, to bring over those people to whom visas were not available on the date of December 31, 1951. Then, we would like to have an additional number of people who can get visas under proper legislation that are German ethnics, people that are willing to get out on our ranches. We lost 300,000 in population in Oklahoma—

Mr. ROSENFELD. In what period of time?

Mr. DILLON. From 1940 to 1950.

Mr. ROSENFELD. What happened that caused that loss of population?

Mr. DILLON. When my father went to Oklahoma, Uncle Sam gave him 160 acres of land for \$15, and everybody took that land and

started out and tried to make a living. My dad said they should have given everybody a section. My dad was able to make it, but the three other men on that section didn't make it, and dad took over their places.

Mr. ROSENFELD. In other words, were the farms too small?

Mr. DILLON. That's right, and could not support them—but the farms became larger, and that left vacant houses. We had plenty of houses over the State, and the DP's that were willing to go out to these farms had plenty of opportunity to do it.

Mr. ROSENFELD. And do they have full-time, year-round jobs?

Mr. DILLON. That's right. No sharecropping in Oklahoma. We insisted that they be put on salary.

At the urging, I might say, of the Displaced Persons Commission in Washington I was requested to assist in getting some of the larger families into Oklahoma, and on telegraphic orders five Ukrainian farm families arrived in Oklahoma City, and I had five sponsors waiting for them. The man that took what seemed to be the hardest family, from the point of resettlement, which was the father and mother and four little girls—most of the sponsors wanted a father and mother with boys in the family—but he took the father and mother and the four little girls, and paid the father \$100 a month for the first year, and gave him housing, and gave him produce from the farm, milk and eggs, saw that he had some help in clothing, and one thing and another. After the first year he found the man was such a good worker, because the man would work 12 and 14 hours a day if he didn't get his work done, and he was always working—he cleaned up the fence rows and even though he fell off the horse and broke his arm he still insisted he had to work every day doing something. After the first year, the sponsor said: "I will now put you on a 50-50 basis." The first thing he did was to buy the DP a car, and paid for it, and said: "If you make any money this year, you can pay me half the price of the car." At the end of the first year with a very good crop they were able to clear \$10,000—\$5,000 for the DP and \$5,000 for the sponsor. In the third year, which is this year, they had 200 head of hogs to sell in May, and I am sure that the DP will do better this year than he did last. He has a new television set, and he has already traded his car in and bought a new car this year. One of his daughters, although she was only 16, married the farm boy across the road, and they are well-established in the community.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Dillon, do you think that Oklahoma could absorb people from overseas who would stay on the farm and work the farms as needed in Oklahoma in any substantial numbers?

Mr. DILLON. I would answer in the affirmative because I know the calls I have had, especially since we started to bring the German ethnics in, who, to me, have been the best farmers that we have had coming into Oklahoma. We have had so many calls since the program ended that we could place as many more as we have already placed.

Mr. ROSENFELD. How many have you placed already?

Mr. DILLON. The records in Washington show we had around 1,600 first placements, and then we have had an influx of more than that coming into the State.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Then what would your estimate be?

Mr. DILLON. Between 3,000 and 4,000.

Mr. ROSENFELD. And do you think that Oklahoma could absorb and needs an additional 4,000 or so?

Mr. DILLON. Desperately needs that type of person.

Mr. ROSENFELD. In what kind of farming would they be engaged?

Mr. DILLON. Of course, they have the big ranches and they need people on the ranch, but there is always enough caretaking around until they can learn how to take care of stock and the dairying is all done by machinery, and they soon handle the mechanical milkers, and we had very little trouble with that—required in dairying and stock industry. There is very little oil industry in Oklahoma—we do not need that type of person.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Would they be needed for cotton?

Mr. DILLON. The cotton is mechanically picked now, and cultivated, and almost everything has gone into machinery.

Mr. ROSENFELD. The reason I ask about the cotton is that the Commission has been given information that as of the beginning of September there was a demand for some 900 cotton pickers. Is that seasonal work?

Mr. DILLON. That's seasonal work. It is simply transit, the cotton picking, what little there is, simply transit work—it is not good for that type of resettlement.

Mr. ROSENFELD. But on year-round, permanent work, which would enable families to settle down and become part of the community, do you estimate that somewhere between 3,500 to 4,000 are desperately needed?

Mr. DILLON. That's right. I am sure of that. I know that sponsors not only would be willing to sponsor the people, but willing to pay their transportation from Europe to America, that is, the steam boat and the railroad both.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Could you advise the Commission, on the basis of your experience in that part of the country, as to the situation of other States in the southwest?

Mr. DILLON. I have first-hand knowledge of Arkansas being in a like situation, although Arkansas is not as good a cattle country as Oklahoma.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Are you saying that Arkansas is in the same situation—in desperate need of labor for year-round employment?

Mr. DILLON. That's right, on a great many of the Arkansas ranches, and I have placed people in Arkansas and also in Texas, west Texas, especially, bordering on Oklahoma City. Of course, Oklahoma City is the largest and most up-to-date and progressive city in the Southwest.

We have provided work with the DP's in Texas, and in Arkansas, and in Oklahoma. We have done very little work in Kansas, but sometimes we have had some people come in from New Orleans and make a stop and then go on up into Kansas, but I am sure northern Texas and western Texas, and Arkansas and Oklahoma—they could absorb more than probably in Oklahoma, at least Texas could.

Mr. ROSENFELD. In your judgement, what number could Texas absorb?

Mr. DILLON. 8,000 or 10,000 people, because I know the Texas people are writing to me all the time, calling me long distance.

Mr. ROSENFELD. And, is this permanent, year-round?

Mr. DILLON. Permanent, year-round, all the farms are modern, electricity, water in the house, gas for heat. Of course there is the problem

of adjustment to the wide-open spaces, you see, the DP's are used to living closely together from the experience in displaced persons' camps, and they are not accustomed to the open spaces.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Do they get accustomed to it?

Mr. DILLON. They like to be in Texas now. We had to move them back from Texas and Oklahoma because there was a family spotted here and one here, and they had to move back and forth. The program should be arranged so that if there are German ethnics there can be 8 or 10 families in one county.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Such a planned resettlement, to be given neighbors among themselves.

Mr. DILLON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell the Commission where the DP's that you have handled came from?

Mr. DILLON. One of our largest settlements came from Latvia, although the Latvians haven't always turned out to be the best farmers. The Latvians have more or less congregated into the larger places and are doing work on a smaller scale like dairying and little acreages where they are just raising chickens, working on chicken ranches, and things like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they become self-supporting?

Mr. DILLON. They do. They have their own services and are very fine citizens. The Estonian group have done very well the same way. The Ukrainians have been able to work out on the farm. They have been more successful on the farm, but the very best success has been with the German ethnics. The Hungarians have been very good, although the native-born Hungarians that are not German ethnics are skilled artisans, so many of them, that they haven't been too happy. We had many doctorates of laws, and skilled men coming in that just weren't too happy on the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. But have they succeeded in integrating themselves into the American life?

Mr. DILLON. Yes. One boy took an idea that he could sell life insurance to the other DP's because he spoke seven languages. While he was selling about five policies to DP's he sold some 50 policies to Americans, and he is now in charge of the Tulsa office of this insurance company, which is considered one of the best, and he is considered one of the best insurance men in the State. He has a very fine personality. I have had him down to talk to the civic clubs and this insurance company wouldn't trade him for 10 ordinary fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it been your experience that most of those who are not farmers, or do not become farmers, but are skilled or have some profession, become integrated into American life and make a contribution in the skill, in the trade, or in the profession they have studied abroad before they came here?

Mr. DILLON. If there is opportunity for that, yes, but, of course, where in the professions licensing is required it is a long process of them getting their citizenship. I am thinking now of medicine and dentistry, and even the nurses training are having a little difficulty in getting them, establishing their high-school graduation before they are admitted to the school of nursing. But that is working out, it takes a little longer time for that kind of a program.

The CHAIRMAN. But does it work out?

Mr. DILLON. It works out.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they become valuable citizens?

Mr. DILLON. Very valuable; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you say the German ethnics. Now what countries do they come from?

Mr. DILLON. My experience with German ethnics has been mostly with those who came from Hungary.

The CHAIRMAN. Hungary?

Mr. DILLON. Yes. There seem to be some good farmers from Hungary that are making a fine establishment. Now, of course, there are a lot of people that have come into Oklahoma under direct sponsorship through the Displaced Persons Commission, that did not come through the State commission office.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Are these in addition to some 1,600 that came through you?

Mr. DILLON. Neither the office in Washington nor my office have an accurate account, I am sure, of all the people. As soon as I could get a boat list, I would make out a card of everyone that was coming to Oklahoma, and kept that on file in my office, so that I would know they were going into certain localities, but I would never have a chance to see these people, and never heard anything about them unless they were having trouble. There are a lot of success stories that I know nothing about.

No one was paid in Oklahoma for any of the resettlement work. I was not given any funds at all—simply my board allowed me to spend some time, and the Governor paid my traveling expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Has most of your experience been with displaced persons from Eastern Europe?

Mr. DILLON. What countries are you speaking of?

The CHAIRMAN. I am thinking of Latvia, and Estonia, and Lithuania, and Southeast Europe, and the Ukraine—Is that where most of your experience has been, with people that came from those areas?

Mr. DILLON. We had a couple of doctors that came from the Philippines—the Shanghai refugees that came through the Philippines.

Mr. ROSENFELD. You mean European refugees who fled to Shanghai?

Mr. DILLON. No; these were Russians.

They went from Russia. When the Communists took over they went to Shanghai—they are Russians. They fled to Shanghai, and then to the Philippines, and then to America. Originally they were East Europeans.

We also helped in the resettlement of some Greeks; mostly young persons, young men from Greece.

Mr. ROSENFELD. How did they work out?

Mr. DILLON. They worked out. Of course, they come mostly to their relatives, and they worked out in following the food business—doing fine in the restaurants. We can always absorb a good many like that.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Do you mean that in the service trades there is also a demand that hasn't been met from within the State?

Mr. DILLON. That's right.

Mr. ROSENFELD. What service trades would you say are affected now?

Mr. DILLON. From all the chamber of commerce talk—you see, Oklahoma City has the greatest number of conventions in the United

States except New York and Chicago, and it is a great convention city, so we have a fine number of hotels, and they have a lot of people there all the time, so there is a great demand in Oklahoma City, and in Tulsa, as well, and in some of the other cities for cooks and service people around the hotels.

The CHAIRMAN. What, if anything, would you like to say to the Commission with respect to the present methods of selecting persons for admission to the United States?

MR. DILLON. In Oklahoma I would feel that because of the changing demand of labor, for instance, in the picking of cotton, now the cotton is picked by machinery, and the cotton picking is not a problem as it used to be; therefore, as our conditions change we would like to have people admitted to the United States who could migrate to Oklahoma, who were especially skilled or had special abilities along what our need was at that time at that year. In one current year we would say a survey in Oklahoma would show that we need so many people in the service field, and so many people especially trained in agriculture, so many people that were mechanics. We find a great demand for auto mechanic people, people that were mechanically inclined. I have had no trouble at all in placing any fellow that had any knack with working with automobiles. Therefore, we could absorb those types of people, and regardless of race or color. I would rather that we would select them on their ability to fill our needs, and absorb our part of the quota.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your view of the national-origins system of selection in our present quota system?

MR. DILLON. That is a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I correctly understand your view to be that whatever number is admitted annually to the United States ought to be admitted on a basis of what this country needs, what the States need, and different sections of the country?

MR. DILLON. Yes; of the country at that current time.

The CHAIRMAN. At that period.

MR. DILLON. It must be flexible enough, so that it can be changed. If Oklahoma absorbs 10,000 one year and fills their needs and the next year they only need 2,000 people.

MR. ROSENFELD. Are you thinking in terms of permanent admission?

MR. DILLON. I am thinking of permanent admission.

MR. ROSENFELD. Mr. Dillon, what form of administration would you recommend for the type of program you are suggesting?

MR. DILLON. I think it should be administered through our present immigration and naturalization set up. We feel that with the immigration and naturalization office in Kansas City they are close enough to us to handle the situation, I believe, after the preliminary work is done, and the people are placed, and the filing of their papers to become citizens.

MR. ROSENFELD. Who would make the determinations and how would you go about making the determination Nation-wide of the numbers to be admitted within the ceiling, and where they are to be chosen from, if they were not to be admitted on the basis of national origin?

Mr. DILLON. Of course, with us, we would like to work it through our county agents, and through our county set-up of agricultural men. We have right now so many of the boys and girls that are sent over, the farm boys and girls that are sent to Oklahoma to stay 1 year under the State Department—I think they have the program, and that has been handled through our county agricultural set-up and State agricultural set-up. That would be the set-up, and your survey work would be done, and your preliminary work in your States, and then it would have to be cleared through a national commission, a special commission that would have to do the screening along somewhat the line that our Displaced Persons Commission carried on this program for the past 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that your proposal would provide a national commission that would fix the over-all number for each year based on local needs throughout the country?

Mr. DILLON. The demands from the States, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And would that agency, whether it was a commission, or a board, then have the responsibility for screening those that came in as to security, and as to health, and other qualifications to meet the local needs throughout the country?

Mr. DILLON. Yes, according to their ability. That way it seems like your whole program could be kept current. A law that is set up now on quotas, or anything else, in 10 years from now has changed, so that we need some way to have it flexible enough so that it could be changed around each year as the Commission would see fit, according to that demand.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that also embrace the use of unskilled labor?

Mr. DILLON. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. If a person or persons are brought in under such a plan, would you also provide that their families would accompany them, so that their families would eventually take their places in the community?

Mr. DILLON. Yes, in the community, that's right, sir.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Would you have any general estimate of whether you think the Southwest in the next 5 years would have a continuing demand of the kind that you have indicated, or is it likely to slough off immediately?

Mr. DILLON. You are acquainted with the golden circle, which includes the Southwest. There is nothing that can stop the advance that we are making out there, that I see, for 5 years there is going to be a great demand for the type of people that I have been talking about.

Mr. ROSENFELD. What States would you include in that demand in which you foresee a great demand for the next 5 years?

Mr. DILLON. Well, I just came through the States of Kansas, and Nebraska, and Iowa this last week, and I talked a little bit about what their needs are, and there is some demand for labor there, but not as much as when we get into Arkansas, and Oklahoma, and Texas, New Mexico—that part of the country has a lot of wealth in oil, and my best sponsors have been fellows that have had farms and ranches that they have bought through profits in oil, and they are raising fine cattle and have established themselves, and they need families to help them in that type of work all throughout the Southwest, and besides our agriculture. When you get into southern Iowa where we were today,

I believe that they have small farms 80 to 160 acres, and one or two farm homes already with people living there, and they can support the families that way. I didn't see the vacant farm houses in those three States that I can take you to, that I am acquainted with in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. It is not a sharecrop proposition, it is people that will make good money because they know how to work.

I would like to ask a question, if I may, of the Commission: I would like to know whether you are also concerned with the matter of overpopulation?

MR. ROSENFELD. In the President's directive to the Commission, section 2 (c) includes the subject of overpopulation, so that the Commission is receiving testimony and judgments of people in that area as well as in the general area of immigration.

THE CHAIRMAN. Of course, that has to do with the needs of other countries, as well as the needs of this country. Would you be in favor of filling the needs that actually exist in this country from those who are in want in Europe, the displaced persons, the escapees, the expellees by screening those people just to fill the actual needs in this country?

MR. DILLON. That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN. And what is your opinion regarding relief for overpopulated countries?

MR. DILLON. That would be all right. But I don't think that overpopulation should be used as too important a factor in itself, because any relief that we might give in America to overpopulation of some of the countries in Europe would purely be temporary, a small country would again become overpopulated. Unless the people had the required skills, unless they would fit in—I am thinking about the people of southern Europe. I am not familiar with any of them being happy to live in our Southwest. They prefer to live as near the conditions, I guess, as they have left in the overpopulated country.

MR. ROSENFELD. What about the people from Greece, you mentioned earlier?

MR. DILLON. Yes, but then they won't, again, go into the open spaces, they congregate in the cities.

MR. ROSENFELD. I see. Then, is your point that the people who come to meet the needs that you have indicated to be your criterion for the selection within the ceiling should be people who are selected specifically to meet the needs as you see them?

MR. DILLON. Yes and not from any other pressure.

THE CHAIRMAN. Suppose another part of the country would need the kind of work that can be furnished by those in Southern Europe?

MR. DILLON. That's right—I am speaking from the point of view of our part of the country, that's all I am familiar with.

THE CHAIRMAN. Are you in favor of any emergency legislation by Congress to provide for the admission of those applicants who were caught in the DP pipeline?

MR. DILLON. Yes. Also I think in recent years those people have become more unpopular as they have lived on the German economy—I mean they haven't been accepted by the economy quite so much now as they were then, because immediately after the war there was need for them, now they seem to be a little bit extra, and they are surplus population now. That seems to be the reaction we get, and it is

because they have relatives here, somebody here who has been writing back and telling them how things are over here.

Mr. ROSENFELD. So far as you know, Mr. Dillon are these pipeline people the same kind of people that made out so well in Oklahoma?

Mr. DILLON. Yes. Further cases we know are the same kin—they are the relatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Dillon, the Commission appreciates your coming all the way to St. Louis to make this statement.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Chairman, may I request that the St. Louis record remain open at this point for the insertion of statements submitted by persons unable to appear as individuals or as representatives of organizations or who could not be scheduled due to insufficient time.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

This concludes the hearings in St. Louis, Mo. The Commission will now be adjourned until it reconvenes in San Francisco, Calif., at 9:30 a. m., October 14, 1952.

(Whereupon, at 6 p. m., the Commission was adjourned to reconvene at 9:30 a. m., Tuesday, October 14, 1952, at San Francisco, Calif.)

STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY OTHER PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY SANDOR D. PAPP, M. D., JOPLIN, MO.

OCTOBER 3, 1952.

HON. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,

*Special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PERLMAN: With reference to the new immigration law which comes into effect next December 24.

Before this law becomes effective, I would like to suggest that every effort be made to reunite families who have become separated through immigration to the United States from Europe after World War II.

As a case in point, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Say, of this city were sent to the United States through International Refugee Organization in 1949. However, through misunderstanding and confusion, their two sons were shipped to Australia.

Attempts have been made to reunite this family, but because of quota restrictions, it seems as if it will take another 5 years to reunite these parents and their sons.

We feel sure there must be many other similar cases of families being separated through no fault of their own, and sincerely hope that our Government can and will act in the name of humanity to correct this injustice.

Yours very truly,

SANDOR D. PAPP, M. D.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY JOSEPH SAY, JOPLIN, MO.

JOPLIN, MO., October 3, 1952.

HON. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,

*Chairman, Special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PERLMAN: Regarding the new immigration law which will become effective next December 24.

May I suggest that before this law becomes effective every effort be made to reunite families who through no fault of their own have become separated by immigration from Europe after World War II.

As an example, my wife and I came to the United States from Hungary in 1945 through the International Refugee Organization but because of misunderstanding our two sons were sent to Australia.

We know of several other cases such as ours and sincerely hope that it will be possible for the United States Government to reunite these families before new, restrictive quotas can be set.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH SAY.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY S. G. WIDIGER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
LUTHERAN CHILDREN'S FRIEND SOCIETY OF KANSAS, WINFIELD,
KANS.

WINFIELD, KANS., OCTOBER 8, 1952.

HARRY N. ROSENFELD,

*Executive Director, President's Commission on Immigration and
Naturalization, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. ROSENFELD: Thank you so much for your letter of September 23 extending me an invitation to appear at a hearing, on the matter of the President's

Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, to be held in St. Louis, Mo., on October 11.

A previous commitment prohibits my attending this hearing, but I am taking the liberty of writing you to express in part my feelings toward the displaced persons program. We have handled many of these family units in the area assigned to me as committee executive for Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas, and have been very active in this work from the beginning of the program. I want to say that with very few exceptions the placement and resettlement of these family units has been most satisfactory. These displaced persons have been well accepted by the people in the various communities. It is my definite opinion that for the most part these displaced persons have been a definite asset to our country.

Let me commend you on the fine work that you have done in carrying out the work of your Commission. We know that you have given your best efforts to help these unfortunate people. We are only sorry for the ones that were left behind due to lack of time. It is the hope of our agency that further legislation will be enacted to allow more of these displaced persons to be brought to our country. We, as an agency, and as a church, want to participate and lend our every assistance and cooperation so that this may be possible.

Thank you again for your kind invitation to appear at the hearing. I only wish that I could appear and express in person my deep feeling for these people, and my sincere desire that the program may again be made active.

Cordially,

LUTHERAN RESETTLEMENT COMMITTEE,
S. G. WIDIGER, *Executive*.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY C. T. PIHLBLAD, PROFESSOR OF
SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO.

Through Dr. C. E. Lively

COLUMBIA, October 30, 1952.

MR. ELLIOT SHIRK,

*President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,
White House, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SHIRK: Following our conversation by telephone while you were in St. Louis, I suggested to our Dr. C. T. Pihlblad of the department of sociology, that he prepare a statement for your Commission. Dr. Pihlblad teaches courses in population, race relations, and allied subjects. Therefore, I feel he is qualified to make a statement.

He prepared the statement and I am enclosing it herewith.

Sincerely yours,

DR. C. E. LIVELY,
Chairman, Department of Rural Sociology.

COMMENTS ON THE IMMIGRATION LAW OF 1952 COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE
McCARRAN ACT

I have been invited to make such comments on the immigration law of 1952 as might appear to be appropriate.

First, I would advocate the abandonment or radical revision of the quota features which have been a part of our basic immigration laws since the National Origins Act of 1924. The quota principle is based on the assumption that immigrants from the countries of northern and western Europe are biologically and socially superior and to be preferred as potential citizens to those from countries in central, south and east Europe. This assumption is scientifically unsound, politically inexpedient and morally indefensible. There is common agreement among anthropologists, psychologists and sociologists that there exist no significant inherent differences between so-called races in intellectual ability or capacity for cultural achievement. There is no evidence in American history that some immigrant groups have made better citizens than others, or that, in relation to the length of their stay in America and their opportunities, have been less assimilable than others. From a political point of view our quota policy has long been a standing offense to national groups whose friendship and co-operation we sorely need and are struggling hard to secure. From a moral point

of view it ill becomes a nation which occupies a position of leadership among the democratic powers to practice an official policy of discrimination based on race and nationality. It seems to me that we need to modify our immigration policy by abandoning the "national origins" principle in favor of a policy which determines admissibility primarily on the basis of individual fitness and desirability.

In addition to the basic discriminatory feature of the law, which is inherent in the quota principle based on national origins there are certain details which, it seems to me, are highly objectionable. During recent months the exclusion of foreign scholars and distinguished scientists from the United States by refusing them visas has become a public scandal. The current issue of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* documents this story in detail. A part of the difficulty lies in the shortsighted and bureaucratic administration of both the immigration law and the McCarran Security Act. But the laws themselves are faulty in not safeguarding the rights of the applicant for a visa by explicitly permitting the right of appeal from the decisions of consular employees and the staff of the immigration service. Certainly it would be most unfortunate if we are to adopt a policy of intellectual and scientific isolationism, and cut ourselves off from scientific developments and achievements abroad by making access to European scholarship and scientific achievement difficult or even impossible.

It seems to me that the repeal of the provisions, contained in the National Origins Act, for admission of scientists, professors and scholars from foreign countries outside the quota of their countries has been most unfortunate. To place the discretion as to their admission in the Attorney General's office is a doubtful expedient. Certainly neither the Attorney General nor his staff are qualified, either by training or experience, to pass on the scientific attainments of such applicants for admission or judge as to the need of the Nation for their services.

The vesting of complete deportation authority in immigration officials without any provision for judicial review is another feature of the law which needs amendment. To permit immigration officials to serve as prosecutor, judge and jury without any right of the defendant to judicial procedure is not consistent with our traditional concept of justice. According to accounts in the daily press persons have been arrested, held for long periods of time and deportation proceedings instituted against them without even informing the defendant as to the nature of the charges against him, or the reasons for his undesirability as a resident.

Another feature of the law, which constitutes a danger to American citizens, is the provision which makes possible investigation into the conditions under which citizenship was obtained indefinitely retrospective. (Even for those accused of crime the statutes of limitations impose some limits on their liability.) Even inadvertent mistakes in the filing and preparation of applications for citizenship might constitute grounds for revocation.

Finally the arbitrary power of immigration officials to deny passports to American citizens for travel abroad should be restricted by clear provision for court review. This issue has received wide publicity in connection with the case of Dr. Linus Pauling. This is not only a matter of right to travel abroad but also involves the issue of destroying the reputation of an American citizen without provision for an answer and defense. We cannot leave such matters to the arbitrary decisions of some immigration officials who may have neither the competence nor the judgment for wise decisions in such cases.

C. T. PHILLIP.

Professor of Sociology, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06352 477 9

